

**115. As stated in the introduction, your comments are completely anonymous. With regard to any written comments you might provide, we would like to compile those comments and include them in our report. Please consider if you wish to include any personal identifying information in these comments. If you would like to provide comments on Edison that may be compiled or summarized and included in our report, please provide them here:**

### **Wave 1**

1. none
2. Overall, given the magnitude of the venture, it is my opinion that the project implementation has been successful to date. Also, as the system matures, it seems to be stabilizing. I don't want to see the momentum slowed down by delaying phase 3.
3. This survey was long and most ALL answers with numbers were estimates and I would not rely on these numbers. The financial modules operate differently and some work good and some need to be improved that could not be communicated in this survey. Reporting has a long way to go and there are not options to say that --the numbers required on this survey cannot communicate that either.
4. If Edison addresses reporting requirements and improves training to incorporate business processes, the Edison System can be a good system for the State.
5. The Edison system has much better potential than STARS/TOPS and will prove to be much more efficient in the near term. Right now, there are still processing issues that need to be improved upon. Between that and the general learning curve, fiscal processing has slowed down for the time being. However, I expect that this will turn around over the next 6 months and the processing time will actually become substantially quicker overall.

### **Wave 2**

1. Parts of Edison are good, parts are not. More attention should be given to listening to end users.
2. There are always going to be some that don't agree with nor they want change. The Edison system in my opinion is a much needed change in State Government, and once the weaknesses are worked out will be a great asset. Our Agency has encouraged employees to discuss all aspects of Edison. Training has occurred, and for the most part I feel that our staff is very comfortable with the changes.
3. None
4. I think this system has the potential to be an improvement, but there needs to be quicker problem resolution and much quicker payment processing. The people assigned to workshops and conference calls have been very helpful in all areas. We need continued access to this kind of help for an extended period.

5. When prepping PeopleSoft for Edison use, the fact that not all agencies operate the same way was never taken into consideration from what I can tell. The Judicial branch is paid once a month for payroll and has several limitations on salaries based on statutory requirements, Edison did not account for these situations in any of their efforts. In the Legacy systems, the month take-home pay was the same from month to month as would be expected. Not in Edison. Since they forced our monthly payroll into the bi-monthly system of calculation, salary/withholding is figured daily. This causes the take-home to vary slightly month-to-month (which as an employee is very annoying for planning purposes) and each month a wealth of phone calls from employees about why their checks are different. We do not earn overtime but it's cost calculation is reflected on each paystub further confusing employees. Time spent on answering these question could be of infinitely more benefit elsewhere. The Edison solution to the monthly payroll was to excluded the time/labor reporting function for our staff. This doesn't cause much problem except that we've lost some accounting detail we used to have in STARS (holiday vs. regular pay, etc.) And Edison was purported to be able to give us greater detail and information that we've ever had available (except it's a nightmare to find any real way of getting to it.)
6. It is a challenge to learn a new system. Many employees in my department have worked very hard to meet that challenge. I believe in time, the benefits we gain from the system, mainly from the information we can retrieve from it, will be worth the effort.
7. While there were many training requirements and sessions, most were aimed at system capabilities and not specifics how of how employees would actually produce a purchase order or pay an invoice in their depts. The real training began when departments arrived at their "Go Live" date – and the system was available for use. At that point the various functions were tried to see what actually worked and what didn't. One of our role-mapping modules was not loaded and it caused a significant delay in it use. This was not a comforting feeling for supervisors and managers responsible for many fiscal employees, and the responsibility of executing financial processes for multi-million departments. While it may take several more months or even a year of two for the system to work effectively and issue correct and useful reports, state employees and supervisors will find methods to make the system work. Over time departments who can use the reporting system will, and those who can't will find "work arounds" to get relevant data needed for month to month financial reports. Another unknown is the ongoing costs of the system. It could be less than that experienced with legacy systems, but it could also be more costly. In the absence of information, it's the assumption that costs will increase significantly, and negatively impact departments financially.
8. It is obvious that Edison was "patched" for government processes. It is a shame that those of us in the "trenches" were not included in the design. If they had, a lot of problems and issues could have been addressed before go-live.
9. Your survey is very poor. Some of your required questions force people to lie. I doubt if any of us can accurately tell you how many hours of training our staff has had before and after implementation. Tennessee needed to be out of the dark ages. If everyone put as

much time into making this project successful as they have trying to make it fail, we would all be better off!

10. Short-term 1. Must focus on how we will be able to close FY 09. Interview agencies, and you will find out lots of work is behind b/c agencies have not had time to work on it. Is it real that those work can be finished by this fiscal year? Do agencies need help? What kinds of help or reports they need? 2. Edison must do a better job of communications. Also they must work with Accounts closer. When they don't, agencies bear consequences. 3. Edison needs to have more staff like Clyde and Bob Lawson. They know Edison, Accounts, and Budget. They know what end results we need to produce. It saves us time when we ask them for help. 4. Do not even think about the go live on July 1 for wave 3. Considering today's system problems, voucher backlogs, reporting, and so forth, I cannot imagine what might happen if we bring those large agencies into the mix. Long Term Fix bad system designs re: some parts of some modules. They create a nightmare inefficiency. Example, We now spend more time on initiating and approving AP vouchers. One invoice per one voucher. Another example, every line of travel claims must be keyed. I can tell you more but ran out of time.
11. The increase in workload and the inordinate amount of time this system requires has to be addressed. Most of the system does appear to work, but it is taking over twice as much time. No efficiencies have been gained. With buyouts and budget cuts, state agencies do not have the resources that it takes to make this system work.
12. It is very, very early to assess anything about this system other than we are in the middle of the transition and that additional resources to support transition issues would be helpful.

### **Wave 3**

1. The state should have taken a stronger role in determining policy and business processes that would fit the system. As a result each agency has tried to keep its current policies and business processes even when those processes don't fit the new system.
2. While I realize that running parallel systems is redundant and takes more time, I think that my staff would have more confidence in processing urgent transactions, if they knew they could correctly process in STARS, if they could not get the transaction correctly into Edison. Debits and credits are not the issue here. Complex transactions are. I am not confident that anyone on the Edison Team except for Clyde Phillips knows our transactions well enough to provide assistance. While I believe that processing transactions will take more of our business day at a time when we are short staffed anyway, this will be very frustrating. I worry that with ARRA, staff shortages and the uncertainties of implementation, we may have created the perfect storm on July 1. We have certain transactions that must occur on July 6 after 2 days in the system and a long 3-day weekend. I am concerned that these transactions are completed by noon on June 6. There appear to be certain transactions that we have requested in Edison that may not be implemented on July 1. I am hopeful that once all of the bugs have been worked out of

the Edison system, everyone will forget about STARS and the system will work as it was envisioned.

3. I am sure that the development of Edison was to be beneficial to the state. I think that agency staff were not heavily involved in the design of the system. It would have been better if Edison staff had acquired a greater understanding of TN State Accounting issues in order to have a better foundation to build on.
4. The classroom training was unnecessary and took people away from their jobs a great deal. We could have done what the instructors did in our own offices from our own PC's. I personally hated STARS so I am looking forward to the change. However, I also know that with a system this large, it is going to be difficult to think of everything that might cause a problem. So we just need to be ready to deal with them quickly when they occur.